



The Moves and Steps in the Literature Review and Discussion Sections in the Four Master's Degree Theses

AUTHORS INFO

La Ode. Muh. Idrus Hamid B.
Universitas Sembilanbelas November Kolaka,
Indonesia
idrussaldiano@yahoo.co.id
+6285298685236

Wa Ode Nur Maulid
Universitas Sembilanbelas November Kolaka,
Indonesia
nurmaulidwaode@gmail.com
+6281354788014

ARTICLE INFO

ISSN: 2502-6909
Vol. 2, No. 1, June 2017
URL: <http://usnsj.com/index.php/JEE/article/view/2.1.51-58>

© 2017 JEE All rights reserved

Abstract

The purpose of this research was to identify moves and steps in the Literature Review and Findings / Discussion chapter of four Master's Degree theses namely JA, LY, ML, and MM. In analyzing the moves and steps in the Literature Review (LR) and Discussion in this research, the researchers used two kinds of framework namely Kwan (2006) framework and Yang & Allison (2003) framework. Kwan framework was used to analyze the moves and steps in the Literature Review, while Yang & Alison's framework was used to analyze moves and steps in the Discussion chapter. It was found that the most frequently used in the LR was Move 1 (Establishing one of the territory of one's own research), Strategy A (surveying the non-research-related phenomena or knowledge claims) included definition or explanations of terminology, constructs and theories. The authors of four Master Degree's theses used Move 1 to present the theories and definition of terms. Then, in the Findings/Discussions, the most frequently used is Move 2 (Reporting Result). The authors used Move 2 in presenting the results of their study (research).

Keywords: moves and steps, move analysis, literature review, discussion

A. Introduction

Thesis is a formal and lengthy research paper, especially a work of original research. It was written in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a graduate degree. The thesis itself has common format, namely Materials predicting the text consist of *Title Page, Acknowledgements, Table of Contents, List of Tables/Figure/Illustration*; The main text consist of *Introduction, Review of Literature, Methodology, Results/Discussion, Conclusion*; and *References and Appendices*. However, in this paper the writer only analyze the Literature Review (LR) and Findings / Discussion of a thesis.

Literature Review is an indispensable task in research writing. Swales and Feak (in Kwan, 2006) stated that Literature Review is a part of a research paper, proposal, thesis, or dissertation and necessary chore. Besides, Hart (in Kwan, 2006) suggest that Literature Review is both an argument for one's research and a part of the process in which the students learn about topic and the field. So, Literature review is theory comes from research report. It comes from dissertation or thesis and journal or article.

According to Brett (in Yang & Allison, 2003) stated that findings are not only the highlighted result but also interpreted and commented upon by the authors. In this case, the author not only present the result of research in the numerical value, graphs, tables or observation but also should interpret and comment the result for making the reader more understand about the result of the research. Furthermore, Basturkamen (in Annuai & Wannaruk, 2013) said that discussion is the author stake claims about how their results are integrated with and contributed to the disciplinary knowledge. In this case, the author takes a look at the findings as a whole, trying to move the readers from the specific information presented in the results section to more general view of how the findings should be interpreted.

Then, Swales (2004) stated that move is a discourse segment that performs a particular communicative function. The move has specific purpose which represented semantic and functional units of texts. Dudley-Evans (in Salimi & Yazdani, 2011) described moves in research article which consisted of nine moves namely: 1) *information moves (background about theory/research aims/methodology)*, 2) *statement of result*, 3) *findings*, 4) *unexpected outcome*, 5) *reference to previous research*, 6) *explanation*, 7) *claim*, 8) *limitation*, and 9) *recommendation*. Those moves actually were stated in the discussion section.

There were many research conducted in analyzing moves and steps in LR and Discussion. Researcher came with analyzing the Research Article. Research Article is the discourse community which includes Introduction-Methods-Results-and Discussion. Research Article is one of genre based approach that should be investigated by using move analysis. According to Bhatia (2002), genre analysis was the analysis of language use in a broader sense in order to account for not only the way text is constructed but also for the way it is likely to be interpreted, used and exploited in specific contexts to achieve specific goals.

One of the genre-based approaches which are used to identify Research Article (RAs) is move analysis. Move analysis is focused on the schematic structures of the text associates with the writer's purpose. Analyzing Research Article using the move-based approach has attracted many researchers. The study which is conducted by Annuai & Wannaruk (2013) was to investigate the rhetorical move structure of English applied linguistic research article discussions published in Thai and International Journal. Yang & Allison's (2003) moved model is used to analyze two corpora comprising of 30 Thai Discussions and 30 International Discussion. Based on the analysis, it was found that both similarities and differences linked to the move occurrence, move-ordering patterns, and move cyclicity. Two corpora in the step employment was marked difference. The finding gained about the useful of particular for novice non-native writer by facilitating them for better understanding the rhetorical structure of research article Discussion in the different publication contexts.

Another research was conducted by Kwan (2006) about the schematic structure of literature reviews in doctoral theses of applied linguistics. In referring the beginning chapters of a thesis, the notion of "introduction" and "literature review" (LR) are often used interchangeably. The study was to identify the rhetorical structure of the LR chapter and compare it with the revised CARS (Creating A Research Space) model by Swales. The data was about Generic moves in Ph.D. thesis introduction that has been posited for thesis introduction. The study found that many of LR chapters display an Introduction-Body-Conclusion structure. However, in the findings, Move 3 appears least frequently.

Based on the above statements, this research had purpose to identifying moves and steps in the Literature Review and Findings / Discussion chapter of four Master's Degree thesis namely Jenkins, Liu, y, Miller, L, and Miller, M.

B. Methodology

This research was a qualitative research which used content analysis method. Content analysis was a research method applied to written or visual materials for the purpose of identifying specified characteristics of the materials (Ary, D., et al., 2010). The data was collected through document analysis in form of written text namely four thesis of Master's Degree. In analyzing the data, researchers used qualitative data analysis. Researchers read through the data, researchers marked the data by hand and coded the data, then making the

data in the form of percentage (Creswell, 2012). The data which were analyzed in this paper came from the four Master's Degree Theses namely *EFL Motivations and Teacher Preference: A Survey of Japanese University Students in Niigata* by Jenkins, A.C. (2005); *Primary level boys' and girls' EFL attitudes and motivations in relation to their language proficiency: A survey from Beijing* by Liu, Y. (2005); *Adult L2 Learners Recollections of Their Experiences in Learning and Using English in an EFL and an ESL Setting: a multi-case study* by Miller, L.J. (2005); and *Improving Aural Comprehension Skills in EFL, Using Authentic Materials: An Experiment with University Students in Niigata, Japan* by Miller, M.K. (2005). Every thesis was consisted of Literature Review (LR) and Findings / Discussion chapter. Furthermore, LR and Findings / Discussion in every thesis were analyzed in term of move and step using some theoretical frameworks from research article that provide the analysis of move and step.

In overcoming the analysis of moves and steps in the Literature Review (LR) and Discussion in this research, researchers used two kinds of framework namely Kwan (2006) framework which was developed by Swales and Yang & Allison (2003) framework. Kwan's was used to analyze the moves and steps in the Literature Review, while Yang & Alison's was used to analyze moves and steps in the Discussion chapter. The table 1 and table 2 were showing the Kwan's in analyzing LR and Yang & Allison's in analyzing Discussion:

Table 1. Kwan's Move Structure for the Thematic Units in LR Chapter (Kwan, 2006)

Move 1	Establishing one of the territory of one's own research by
Strategy A#	surveying the non-research-related phenomena or knowledge claims
Strategy B#	claiming centrality
Strategy C	surveying the research-related phenomena
Move 2	Creating a research niche (in response of move 1) by:
Strategy A	creating-claiming
Strategy B	gap-indicating
Strategy C	asserting confirmative claims about knowledge or research practices surveyed
Strategy D	asserting the relevancy of the surveyed claims to the one's own research
Strategy E	abstracting or synthesizing knowledge claims to establish a theoretical position or a theoretical framework
Move 3(optional)	Occupying the research niche by announcing:
Strategy A	research aims, focuses, research questions or hypotheses)
Strategy B	theoretical positions/theoretical frameworks)
Strategy C	research design/processes)
Strategy D	interpretations of terminology used in the thesis)

Table 2. Yang & Allison Move-Structure Framework in Discussion Chapter (Yang & Allison (2003)

Move 1	Background Information (the aims, objective, procedural information, theories, and research questions)
Move 2	Reporting Result
Move 3	Summarizing Result
Move 4	Commenting on Result Step 1 (A): Interpreting results Step 2 (B): Comparing/Contrasting results with literature Step 3 (C): Accounting for results Step 4 (D): Evaluating results
Move 5	Summarizing the Study
Move 6	Evaluating the Study Step 1 (A): Indicating limitations Step 2 (B): Indicating significance / advantages, and / or Step 3 (C): Evaluating methodology
Move 7	Deductions from Research Step 1 (A): Making suggestions

Step 2 (B): Recommending further research
Step 3 (C): Drawing pedagogic implications

C. Findings and Discussion

Below was the result of moves and steps analysis in Literature Review and Findings/Discussion of the four Master Degree's theses. Every thesis was analyzed its LR and Findings/Discussion by identifying moves and steps. The findings of LR analysis were seen in the table 3:

Table 3. Move Analysis in Literature Review (Kwan's Move Structure)

Moves / Strategies	Thesis 1 (Jenkins)	Thesis 2 (Liu, Y)	Thesis 3 (Miller, L)	Thesis 4 (Miller, M)
Move 1 (Establishing one of the territory of one's own research)				
Strategy A# (surveying the non-research-related phenomena or knowledge claims)	17	58	50	40
Strategy B# (claiming centrality)	4	5	3	2
Strategy C (surveying the research-related phenomena)	21	23	3	36
Move 2 (Creating a research niche (in response of move 1) by:				
Strategy A (creating-claiming)	10	4	2	8
Strategy B (gap-indicating)	6	1	1	5
Strategy C (asserting confirmative claims about knowledge or research practices surveyed)	1	1	0	8
Strategy D (asserting the relevancy of the surveyed claims to the one's own research)	0	0	0	0
Strategy E (abstracting or synthesizing knowledge claims to establish a theoretical position or a theoretical framework)	5	6	4	3
Move 3 (occupying the research niche by announcing:				
Strategy A (research aims, focuses, research questions or hypotheses)	0	0	5	6
Strategy B (theoretical positions/theoretical frameworks)	0	0	5	0
Strategy C (research design/processes)	4	0	1	0
Strategy D (interpretations of terminology used in the thesis)	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	68	98	74	108

The table 3 showed the result of Moves and Steps analysis in the Literature Review from four Master Degree's theses. Based on the above table, in the Move 1 (Establishing one of the territory of one's own research) there were 17 Strategy A#, 4 Strategy B#, and 21 Strategy C for Thesis 1 (Jenkins). There were 58 Strategy A#, 5 Strategy B#, and 23 Strategy C for Thesis 2 (Liu, Y). There were 50 Strategy A#, 3 Strategy B#, and 3 Strategy C for Thesis 3 (Miller, L). There were 40 Strategy A#, 2 Strategy B#, and 36 Strategy C for Thesis 4 (Miller, M). Then, in the Move 2 (Creating a research niche) there were 10 Strategy A, 6 Strategy B, 1 Strategy C, and 5 Strategy E for Thesis 1 (Jenkins). There were 4 Strategy A, 1 Strategy B, 1 Strategy C, and 6 Strategy E for Thesis 2 (Liu, Y). There were 2 Strategy A, 1 Strategy B, and 4 Strategy E for Thesis 3 (Miller, L). There were 8 Strategy A, 5 Strategy B, 8 Strategy C, and 3 Strategy E for Thesis 4 (Miller, M). Furthermore, in the Move 3 (Occupying the research niche) there were 4 strategies C for Thesis 1 (Jenkins). There was no strategy in the Move 3 for Thesis 2 (Liu, Y). There were 5 Strategy A, 5 Strategy B, and 1 Strategy C for Thesis 3 (Miller, L). There were 6 Strategy A for Thesis 4 (Miller, M) and no Strategy B, C, and D.

Based on the Kwan's framework (2006) in analyzing LR, **Move 1 (Establishing one of the territory of one's own research) consisted of Strategy A#; B#; and C**, in the Strategy A# (surveying the non-research-related phenomena or knowledge claims) included definition or

explanations of terminology, constructs and theories. It also included the beliefs and characterization of non-research practices or phenomena that are associated with the themes of the LR. In the Strategy B# was consisted of claim centrality, importance, and significance of the theme surveyed. This strategy asserted the centrality of themes by referring to both epistemic and non-epistemic phenomena. In the Strategy C was a survey research-related phenomenon by reviewing the aspects of previous studies such as procedures, materials, subjects, and findings. In the Literature Review, it marked by the word "found" e.g. *One study found* that it was effective, appealing and efficient.

In the **Move 2 (Creating a research niche) consisted of Strategy A, B, C, D, and E**, in the Strategy A referred to the creating claiming which involved the critique existing of the topics or issues or problems that were associated with existing research and/or non-research practice. In the Strategy 2 (B) (gap-indicating) was related to the lack of understanding of a particular phenomenon and it was needed for research or non-research action. In the Strategy C, it meant that there was a claim which made about the significance, value or strength of a citations or claims. In the Strategy D, it meant the relevance of claims to proposed study. However, sometimes this strategy was explicitly in the research. Then, strategy E involved presenting arguments for introducing a new perspective or a theoretical framework that is abstracted from the works cited in move 1.

In the **Move 3 (Occupying the research niche) consisted of Strategy A, B, C, and D**, strategy A was referred to the aims, objective, research question or hypotheses of the research. Strategy B was announcing the theoretical position or the theoretical framework. Strategy C was announcing the research design or the research process. Furthermore, in the Strategy D was announcing the adoption of terms or definition of terms.

On the other hand, the table 4 was the distribution of Moves and Steps in the Findings / Discussion chapter.

Table 4. Move Analysis in Findings and Discussion (Nodoushan's Framework)

Moves	Thesis 1 (Jenkins)	Thesis 2 (Liu, Y)	Thesis 3 (Miller, L)	Thesis 4 (Miller, M)
Move 1 (Background Information)	18	8	14	5
Move 2 (Reporting Result)	29	19	15	3
Move 3 (Summarizing Results)	6	8	5	1
Move 4 (Commenting Results)				
Step 1 (A): Interpreting results	15	8	20	5
Step 2 (B): Comparing/contrasting results with literature	8	5	0	8
Step 3 (C): Accounting for results	0	0	0	0
Step 4 (D): Evaluating results	1	0	0	1
Move 5 (Summarizing the study)	1	3	4	7
Move 6 (Evaluating the study)				
Step 1 (A): Indicating limitation	6	0	0	13
Step 2 (B): Indicating significant	0	0	0	0
Step 3 (C): Evaluating methodology	0	0	0	7
Move 7 (Deduction from research)				
Step 1 (A): Making Suggestion	0	0	2	5
Step 2 (B): Recommending Research	0	0	0	0
Step 3 (C): Implication	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	84	51	60	55

Based on the table 4, it was seen that there were 18 Move 1 in the Thesis 1 (Jenkins), 8 Move 1 in the Thesis 2 (Liu, Y), 14 Move 1 in the Thesis 3 (Miller, L), and 5 Move 1 in the Thesis 4 (Miller, M). Then, there were 29 Move 2 in the Thesis 1 (Jenkins), 19 Move 2 in the Thesis 2 (Liu, Y), 15 Move 2 in the Thesis 3 (Miller, L), and 3 Move 2 in the Thesis 4 (Miller, M). Furthermore, there were 6 Move 3 in the Thesis 1 (Jenkins), 8 Move 3 in the Thesis 2 (Liu, Y), 5 Move 3 in the Thesis 3 (Miller, L) and 1 Move 3 in the Thesis 4 (Miller, M).

In the Move 4, it was consisted of four steps. Based on the table, there were 15 Step 1 (A), 8 Step 2 (B), 1 Step 4 (D), 1 Move 5, 6 Step 1 (A) in the Move 6 for Thesis 1 (Jenkins). Then, in the Thesis 2 (Liu, Y) there were 8 Step 1 (A) and 5 Step 2 (B) in the Move 4; and also 3 Move 5. In

the Thesis 3 (Miller, L), there were 20 Step 1 (A) in the Move 4; and also 4 Move 5; 2 Step 1 (A) in the Move 7. In the Thesis 4 (Miller, M), there were 5 Step 1 (A), 8 Step 2 (B), and 1 Step 4 D in the Move 4; there were 7 Move 5; then 13 Step 1 (A) and 7 Step 3 (C) in the Move 6; then 5 Step 1 (A) in the Move 7. The total data for Thesis 1 was 84; Thesis 2 was 51; Thesis 3 was 60; and Thesis 4 was 55.

For analyzing Moves and Steps of Findings / Discussion chapter, researchers used Yang & Allison' framework. This framework identified seven rhetorical moves that used in analyzing Discussion. **Move 1 was about background information.** The author of the article or journal used this moves to analyze the aims, objective, procedural information, theories and research question. **Move 2 was used to reporting Result.** It was signed by "reporting verbs" and "past tense". The result here was presented in the examples, numerical values, graphs, tables, or observations. **Move 3 was used to summarizing result but different from move 2.** It only focused on summarizing the result of the research that will be discussed. **Move 4 was used to commenting the result.** It was consisted of four Steps namely Step 1 (A): interpreting results; Step 2 (B): Comparing/Contrasting results with literature; Step 3 (C): Accounting for results; and Step 4 (D): Evaluating results.

Furthermore, **Move 5 was used to summarizing the study.** In this case, the authors provided the whole summary of the study. Move 5 had signals as present perfect tense together with the words "study" and "research". It was found at the end of the discussion. **Move 6 was used to evaluating the study.** It was consisted of 3 steps namely Step 1 (A): indicating limitation; Step 2 (B): Indicating significance/advantage; and Step 3 (C): Evaluating Methodology. Then, **Move 7 was deduction from research.** It also consisted of 3 steps namely Step 1 (A): making suggestions; Step 2 (B): recommending further research, and/or; Step 3 (C): Drawing pedagogic implications.

In addition, the findings of analyzing Moves and Steps of LR also presented in percentage (%). It can be seen in the table 5:

Table 5. Distribution of Literature Review (LR) Chapter in Percent (%)

Move/Strategy	In percent (%)			
	Thesis 1 (n = 68)	Thesis 2 (n = 98)	Thesis 3 (n = 74)	Thesis 4 (n = 108)
Move 1				
Strategy A#	25 %	59,2 %	67,6 %	37 %
Strategy B#	5,9 %	5,1 %	4,1 %	1,9 %
Strategy C	30,9 %	23,5 %	4,1 %	33,3 %
Move 2				
Strategy A	14,7 %	4,1 %	2,7 %	7,4 %
Strategy B	8,8 %	1 %	1,4 %	4,6 %
Strategy C	1,5 %	1 %	0	7,4 %
Strategy D	0	0	0	0
Strategy E	7,4 %	6,1 %	5,4 %	2,8 %
Move 3				
Strategy A	0	0	6,8 %	5,6 %
Strategy B	0	0	6,8 %	0
Strategy C	5,9 %	0	1,4 %	0
Strategy D	0	0	0	0
Total	100	100	100	100

Based on the table 5, Move 1: Strategy C (*Surveying the research related-phenomena*) was the most frequently used of Move in Thesis 1. It was showed from the percentage = 30,9 %. While the Move 2: Strategy C (*asserting confirmative claims about knowledge or research practices surveyed*) was rarely used in the Thesis 1. It was showed from the percentage = 1,5 %.

In the Thesis 2, the most widely used by the author was Move 1: Strategy A# (*surveying the non-research-related phenomena or knowledge claims*) = 59,2 %. Step B and Step C in Move 2 was used rarely by the author. It was used only 1 %. Then in the Thesis 3, Move 1: Strategy A# (*surveying the non-research-related phenomena or knowledge claims*) also used widely in the thesis with the percentage 67,6 %, while Move 2 Strategy B and Move 3 Strategy C was used rarely. It was only 1,4 %. However, in the Thesis 4, Move 1 Strategy A# (*surveying the non-research-related phenomena or knowledge claims*) was also used commonly in the thesis. It was

37 % while Strategy B# in Move 1 only 1,9 % was used by the author in the thesis. The table 6 below was the percentage of analysis for Findings / Discussion chapter.

Table 6. Distribution of Findings / Discussion Chapter in Percent (%)

Move/Step	In percent (%)			
	Thesis 1 (n = 84)	Thesis 2 (n = 51)	Thesis 3 (n = 60)	Thesis 4 (n = 55)
Move 1	21,4 %	15,7 %	23,3 %	9,1 %
Move 2	34,5 %	37,3 %	25 %	5,5 %
Move 3	7,1 %	15,7 %	8,3 %	1,8 %
Move 4				
Step 1 (A)	17,9 %	15,7 %	33,3 %	9,1 %
Step 2 (B)	9,5 %	9,8 %	0	14,5 %
Step 3 (C)	0	0	0	0
Step 4 (D)	1,2 %	0	0	1,8 %
Move 5	1,2 %	5,9 %	6,7 %	12,7 %
Move 6				
Step 1 (A)	7,1 %	0	0	23,6 %
Step 2 (B)	0	0	0	0
Step 3 (C)	0	0	0	12,7 %
Move 7				
Step 1 (A)	0	0	3,3 %	9,1 %
Step 2 (B)	0	0	0	0
Step 3 (C)	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	100	100	100	100

Based on the table 6, Move 2 in the Thesis 1 was always appeared. It was showed from the percentage = 34,5 % while Move 4 (Step D) and Move 5 was only 1,2 %. It meant that the frequency of this move was very low in the thesis. Then, in the Thesis 2, Move 2 was still used widely by the author (37,3 %) while Move 5 only used 5,9 % by the author. In the Thesis 3, Move 4: Step 1(A) was used 33,3 %. It was the most common used in the Thesis 3 while Move 7: Step 1(A) only 3,3 % used by the author. The last, in the Thesis 4; Move 6: Step 1(A) was widely used by the author with the percentage 23,6 % while Move 3 and Move 4: Step 4(D) was rarely used. It was shown from the percentage 1,8 %.

D. Conclusion

Based on the above discussion, researchers took conclusion that Literature review (LR) was a part of research paper, proposal, or thesis. It indicated the arguments of the research that gave briefly explanation to the reader about the research. Then, the Findings/Discussion (FD) was the author's claim about the result of the research that should be contributed for other disciplinary knowledge. Furthermore, in analyzing LR and FD, researchers used two kinds of framework namely Kwan framework for LR analysis and Yang & Allison framework for FD analysis. The result of the analysis shown that the most frequently used in the LR was **Move 1 (Establishing one of the territory of one's own research), Strategy A (surveying the non-research-related phenomena or knowledge claims)** which included definition or explanations of terminology, constructs and theories. The authors of four Master Degree's theses used **Move 1** to present the theories and definition of terms, while in the FD, the most frequently used was **Move 2 (Reporting Result)**. The authors used Move 2 in presenting the results of their study (research).

E. References

- Annuai, W. & Wannaruk, A. (2013). Investigating Move Structure of English Applied Linguistics Research Article Discussions Published in International and Thai Journals. *English Language Teaching*, 6(2).
- Ary, D., Cheser, L., & Sorenson, C. (2010). *Introduction to Research in Education*, 8th Edition. United States: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Bhatia, V.K. (2002). Applied Genre Analysis: A Multi-Perspective Model. *IBERICA*, 4, 3-19.
- Creswell, J.W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*, 4th Edition. Boston: Pearson Education.

- Jenkins, A.C. (2005). *EFL Motivations and Teacher Preference: A Survey of Japanese University Students in Niigata*. University of Surrey. Surrey: Unpublished Thesis.
- Jian, Hu. (2010). The Schematic Structure of Literature Review in Research Articles of Applied Linguistics. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 33(5), 15 – 26.
- Kwan, B.S.C. (2006). The schematic structure of literature reviews in doctoral theses of applied linguistics. *English for Specific Purposes*, 25, 30-35.
- Liu, Yu. (2005). *Primary Level Boys' and Girls' EFL Attitudes and Motivations in Relation to Their Language Proficiency: A Survey from Beijing*. University of Surrey. Surrey: Unpublished Thesis.
- Miller, L.J. (2005). *Adult L2 Learners' Recollections of Their Experiences in Learning and Using English in an EFL and an ESL Setting: a multi-case study*. University of Surrey. Surrey: Unpublished Thesis.
- Miller, M.K. (2005). *Improving Aural Comprehension Skills in EFL, Using Authentic Materials: An Experiment with University Students in Niigata, Japan*. University of Surrey. Surrey: Unpublished Thesis.
- Salimi, S. & Yazdani, M. (2011). Move Analysis of the Discussion Section of Sociolinguistics and Testing Articles: Are Standards Met? *International Conference on Languages, Literature and Linguistics*, 26, 354-358.
- Swales, J.M. (2004). *Research Genres: Explorations and Applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524827>. Accessed on January, 2017.
- Yang, R., & Allison, D. (2003). Research Articles in Applied Linguistics: Moving from Results to Conclusions. *English for Specific Purposes*, 22, 365-385.